

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated April 14, 2008. Reconsideration and favorable action in this case are respectfully requested.

The Examiner has objected to claims 3, 5, 8, 14, 16 and 19 due to informalities. Based on the Examiner's comments, however, it appears that the Examiner meant to object to claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 12, and 17. If the Examiner in fact objected to claims 14, 16 and 19, Applicant will need further detail on what those objections might be. Applicant has amended the claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8, 12, 17 in accordance with the Examiner's concerns.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 6, 12 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Although not specifically rejected, the Examiner listed claims 23, 24, 25, 26, and 27 in his remarks. Applicant has amended these claims in accordance with the Examiner's concerns, except for claim 24 which does not recite the specified language.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-14, 16-22 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Pat. No. 6,463,534 to Geiger in view of U.S. Pat. No. 6,647,494 to Drews and further in view of U.S. Pat. No. 7,302,487 to Ylonen. Applicants have reviewed these references in detail and do not believe that they disclose or make obvious the invention as claimed.

Applicant notes with appreciation that claims 23-27 and 29-31 have been indicated as allowable if rewritten into independent form.

Applicant notes that the Examiner has indicated that the Office Action is non-final on page 1, but on page 14 states that the rejection is final. Applicant assumes that this language was inadvertently left from the previous Office Action.

Applicant further notes that in the rejections of independent claims 6, 12 and 17, the Examiner continues to cite references to England and Kasvan, which are not part of the rejection.

In the Amendment of March 3, 2008, Applicants made a good faith effort to forward prosecution by amending the independent claims to include specific configuration parameters based on the allowed claims. These include: the speed of a hardware component of the processing device, access to one or more normally hidden memory locations or the enablement or disablement of a hardware component.

The Examiner states that the Geiger and Drew references do not disclose setting one or more of the speed of a hardware component of the processing device, access to one or more normally hidden memory locations or the enablement or disablement of a hardware component. The Examiner has added the Ylonen reference, purportedly to show the setting of one or more of these possible configuration parameters stored in a certificate bound to the processing device.

Applicants have reviewed the Ylonen reference carefully and do not believe that Ylonen shows setting any of these configuration parameters. The Examiner specifically cited column 17, lines 25-40, along with Figure 4B (reference numeral 440) and Figure 5 (reference numeral 558).

The text cited by the Examiner does not specify any particular configuration parameter. Step 440 (from Figure 4A) cited by the Examiner merely recites: “storing 440 said encrypted and digitally signed configuration information in a memory means accessible to a distribution entity”. The description of what constitutes “configuration information” is not specified – this step merely stores it somewhere in memory.

Similarly, hardware 558 (from Figure 5) is merely “computer software code means 558 for causing a set of configuration information to be stored in said memory means”. Once again, this only states that the device has a software which stores configuration information in a memory – it does not specify any configuration parameter that comes in the categories set forth in the claims, i.e., the speed of a hardware component of the processing device, access to one or more normally hidden memory locations or the enablement or disablement of a hardware component. There is no indication that the “memory means 530 accessible by the distribution entity” is not otherwise accessible –

and in any case, the memory means is not made available by the “configuration information” of Ylonen.

Accordingly, Applicants do not believe that Ylonen adds any teaching which describes configuring the processing device responsive to configuration parameters stored in a certificate to set: the speed of a hardware component of the processing device, access to one or more normally hidden memory locations or the enablement or disablement of a hardware component. Applicants assume from the rejection of claim 28 that the Examiner believes Ylonen teaches the step of enabling or disabling operation of one or more hardware components. However, Applicant cannot find any such teaching in Ylonen.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully request allowance of independent claims 1, 6, 12 and 17, along with dependent claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 16, 18, 19, and 21-31.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment, including extension fees, to Deposit Account No. 20-0668 of Texas Instruments Incorporated.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. However, should there remain unresolved issues that require adverse action, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone Alan W. Lintel, Applicants' Attorney at (972) 664-9595 so that such issues may be resolved as expeditiously as possible.

For these reasons, and in view of the above amendments, this application is now considered to be in condition for allowance and such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully Submitted,

/Alan W. Lintel/

Alan W. Lintel
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 32478

July 14, 2008
Anderson, Levine & Lintel
14785 Preston Rd.
Suite 650
Dallas, Texas 75254
Tel. (972) 664-9595